

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-15, 19-22 are now in this case. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitation of claim 2, and claim 2 has been cancelled as redundant. Claims 8, 11 and 13 have been amended for clarity. Claims 16, 17 and 18 have been cancelled as directed to non-elected species, and claims 19-22 have been added to claim features of preferred embodiments discussed in connection with Figs. 4A and 4B. All claims have been rejected.

Claims 1-2 (now claim 1) and 6-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as anticipated by Xia *et al.* These rejections are respectfully traversed.

It is well established that a prior publication is measured in anticipation by what it clearly and definitely discloses. To anticipate a claimed invention, the publication must disclose each and every limitation of the claim.

Applicant's independent claim 1 (as amended to include the limitation of claim 2) is directed to a method for forming a patterned layer by printing an inked pattern, patterning the substrate using the inked pattern and removing the inked pattern. The latter step, it was discovered, is needed to enable good connections between the patterned layer and other components. See p. 9, lines 9-10.

With respect to this removal step the Examiner has stated:

As to claims 2 and 12, see step 1c, wherein the substrate is inherently passed to a wet chemical means for removing the inked pattern from the substrate.

Applicant's respectfully disagree. Nothing in Xia *et al.*, including Fig. 1, discloses removal of the inked monolayer. The Examiner's assertion that the Xia wet chemical means inherently removes the inked pattern is something that

would be expected but is contrary to what applicants have discovered. The wet etching of the substrate does not remove the inked layer and a separate removal step is required to obtain good connection to subsequent layers in an electronic device (p. 9, lines 9-10). Accordingly claim 1 and its dependent claims patentably distinguish from Xia *et al.*

Claims 1-12 also have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103 as unpatentable over Xia *et al.* in view of United States Patent No. 5,925,259 issued to Biebuyck *et al.* These rejections are also traversed.

Biebuyck relates to a different method using a stamp structure to apply etchant or dopant. In particular Biebuyck fails to remedy the deficiencies of the primary reference to Xia *et al.* Specifically, neither reference teaches or suggests the claimed removal of the inked masking layer. Thus claim 1 and its dependent claims patentably distinguish from Xia *et al.* and Biebuyck.

Claims 13-15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102 as anticipated by United States Patent No. 4,126,511 issued to Ford. These rejections are believed inapplicable to the claims as amended. Specifically, claim 13 has been amended to make clear that the method makes an electronic device by defining on a flexible layer, electrode patterns having features with a resolution of 30 μ m or smaller and applying semiconducting and dielectric layers over the electrode pattern to form the electronic device.

Ford relates to formation of an aluminum lead frame strip which is not a device which requires a high resolution electrode pattern and subsequent application of semiconducting and dielectric layers to complete. Thus Ford does not anticipate independent claim 13 or dependent claims 14 and 15.

In view of the foregoing it is submitted that claims 1, 3-15 and 19-22 are now clear and patentably distinguish from the cited art. Accordingly this

application now fully complies with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. Sections 112, 102 and 103 and is now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Glen E. Books
Reg. No. 24,950
Attorney for Applicants

November 22, 2000

MATHEWS, COLLINS, SHEPHERD & GOULD, P.A.
100 Thanet Circle, Suite 306
Princeton, New Jersey 08540-3662
Telephone: (609) 924-8555
Facsimile: (609) 924-3036